IN THE HIGH COURT OF UTTARANCHAL AT NAINITAL

WRIT PETITION NO. 3380 (MS) OF 2001
(Old No. 5099 of 1984)

Chet Ram and others. ……Petitioner.

Versus

District Judge Dehradun and others …..Respondents.

HON'BLE RAJESH TANDON J.

Heard counsel for the petitioner and Standing Counsel for the respondents.

By the present Writ Petition the Revision under Section 18 of U.P. Act No. 13 of 1972 filed by the landlord has been rejected.

The Rent Control and Eviction Officer has recorded a finding that the order dated 13th July, 1982 by which the premises in question was declared as vacant has not been passed in accordance with law.

The learned counsel for the petitioner has preferred the present Writ Petition challenging those orders. Since the procedure prescribed under the Rules framed under U.P. Act No. 13 of 1972 with regard to the inspection of the premises under Rule 8 having not been complied with, I do not find any infirmity with the order.

The Writ Petition is dismissed. No order as to costs.

(RAJESH TANDON J.)

04.10.2004
P.S. Rathour